

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 27-38 are now pending in the application. Claims 12 and 27-38 stand rejected. Claims 1-11 are objected to. Claims 13-26 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 7, 9, 27, 33 and 35 are objected to for certain informalities.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 27, 33 and 35 are objected to for certain syntax informalities for which the Examiner requests correction. As set forth above, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 7, 9, 27, 33 and 35, in accordance with the Examiner's request.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Objections to Claims 1, 7, 9, 27, 33 and 35 be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 7, 9, 27, 33 and 35 are now in allowable condition.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

A. Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 has been amended, as set forth above. Particularly, the phrase "the laser pulse width" has been replaced with the phrase "the optical signal pulse width" for which proper antecedent basis is provided in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejection of Claim 12 be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 12 is now in allowable condition.

B. Claims 27-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner suggests that there is no structural cooperative relationship claimed between the Claim 27 recitations, “directing *the pulsed optical signal* to a plurality of ignition points *within a single combustion chamber*” and “*a solid fuel contained in a combustion chamber*”.

Applicant has provided such a structural cooperative relationship by amending Claim 27, as set forth above, to recite, *inter alia*, “directing the pulsed optical signal to a plurality of ignition points within a single combustion chamber containing the solid fuel”.

Claims 28-38 depend from amended Claim 27.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejections of Claims 27-38 be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 27-38 are now in allowable condition.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner’s conditional allowance of Claims 1-12 and 27-38. Applicant respectfully submits that all the stated grounds for rejection of Claims 12 and 27-38 have been overcome by the amendments to Claims 12 and 27-38, as set forth above, made in accordance with the Examiner’s requests. Similarly, Applicant respectfully submit that all the grounds for objection to Claims 1, 7, 9, 27, 33, and 35 have been overcome by the amendments to Claims 1, 7, 9, 27, 33, and 35, as set forth above, made in accordance with the Examiner’s requests.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, i.e., Claims 1-12 and 27-38 are now in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7525.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 29, 2008

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-726-7500

By: _____


Scott T. Gray, Reg. No. 48,891